



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/728,421	11/28/2000	Steven K. Yoshinaga	A-579D	4100

7590 07/25/2003  
M PAUL BAKER ESQ  
FINNEGAN HENDERSON FARABOW GARRETT & DUNNER LLP  
1300 I STREET NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3315

EXAMINER
----------

ROARK, JESSICA H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1644

DATE MAILED: 07/25/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application N .

09/728,421

Applicant(s)

YOSHINAGA, STEVEN K.

Examiner

Jessica H. Roark

Art Unit

1644

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 May 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1 and 8-31 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 35 and 38 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-7, 32-34, 36 and 37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 October 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 24.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

## RESPONSE TO APPLICANT'S AMENDMENT

1. Applicant's amendment, filed 5/5/03 (Paper No. 26), is acknowledged.

Claims 32-38 have been added.

Claims 2-7 have been amended.

Claims 1-38 are pending.

Claims 1 and 8-31 in full, and claims 3-7 as they read on the non-elected nucleic acid of SEQ ID NO:1 encoding the CRP-1 polypeptide of SEQ ID NO:2, are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in Paper No. 21 based upon an incomplete response.

It is noted that Applicant has amended instant claims 3-7 to now recite subject matter of Group I (as set forth in Paper No. 18), a group non-elected without traverse in Paper No. 21.

Claims 2 and 32-38 (in full) and claims 3-7 only as they relate to a nucleic acid encoding a B7RP1 polypeptide (SEQ ID NOS:6, 11 and 16) are under consideration in the instant application.

2. This Office Action will be in response to applicant's arguments, filed 5/5/03 (Paper No. 26). The rejections of record can be found in the previous Office Action (Paper No. 23).

It is noted that New Grounds of Rejection are set forth herein.

Rejection and objections of record in Paper No. 23 but not reiterated herein have been obviated by Applicant's amendment, filed 5/5/03.

### *Sequence Compliance*

3. This application contains sequence disclosures that are encompassed by the definitions for nucleotide and/or amino acid sequences set forth in 37 CFR 1.821(a)(1) and (a)(2). A computer readable form (CRF) of the sequence listing was submitted 10/28/02, as was a Paper Copy and Statement.

The amendment filed 5/5/03 directed cancellation of the amendment filed 10/28/02. Thus there is no longer a Paper Copy of the Sequence Listing pending in the instant file. In addition, the CRF file 10/28/02 does not correspond to the sequences present in the instant application due to the inclusion of SEQ ID NOS:38 and 39.

Applicant is required to provide a new Paper Copy of the Sequence Listing, a corrected CRF, and a Statement that the Paper Copy and CRF are identical.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 second paragraph***

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112.

*The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.*

5. Claims 2-7, 32-34 and 36-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

A) Claims 2, 33, 34, 36, 37 and dependent claims 3-7 and 32 are indefinite in that they recite an arbitrary protein name, "B7RP1". The specification does not appear to provide an explicit definition of the term "B7RP1" since "all related polypeptides described herein", including polypeptides which do necessarily share substantial structure or function with the polypeptides set forth in SEQ ID NOS:7 or 12, are encompassed in the description of a "B7RP1 polypeptide" disclosed on pages 41-42 of the specification.

Applicant should particularly point out and distinctly claim "B7RP1" by claiming a sufficient number of characteristics associated with the protein (e.g. activity and amino acid composition, etc.).

B) Claims 2, 33, 34, 36, 37 and dependent claims 3-7 and 32 are indefinite in their recitation of a nucleic acid encoding polypeptides and polypeptide fragments having "at least one activity characteristic" of B7RP1. Although the specification discloses on page 43 at lines 12-23 that binding to a CRP1 polypeptide and the ability to stimulate T cell proliferation and/or activation are activities which are characteristic of a B7RP1 polypeptide, the disclosure of two activities possessed by a B7RP1 polypeptide does not establish the metes and bound of what constitutes an "activity characteristic" of B7RP1.

It is suggested that Applicant limit the claims to a disclosed activity, but Applicant is cautioned that recitation of the term "CRP1", also an arbitrary protein name, would be considered indefinite as set forth supra for the term "B7RP1".

C) The recitation of "high stringency conditions" in claim 2, as well as claims 3-7 and 32-33 dependent therefrom, is still ambiguous. Although the specification discloses on page 24 general parameters for calculating such conditions and examples of such conditions, in the absence of a clear definition of the metes and bounds of this phrase it is unclear which conditions are actually claimed.

It is again suggested that Applicant amend the claims to recite a particular set of hybridization and wash conditions, such as those exemplified on page 24 of the specification, to overcome this rejection.

D) Applicant is reminded that any amendment must point to a basis in the specification so as not to add new matter. See MPEP 714.02 and 2163.06.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 first paragraph***

6. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

*The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.*

7. Claims 2-7 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The following *written description* rejection is set forth herein.

The specification discloses the nucleic acids of SEQ ID NO:11 and SEQ ID NO:16, encoding the polypeptides of SEQ ID NO:12 and SEQ ID NO:17 which are two forms of a human B7-RP1 polypeptide. The specification also discloses SEQ ID NO:6 encoding the polypeptide of SEQ ID NO:7 which is a mouse B7-RP1 polypeptide.

Applicant's arguments, filed 5/5/03, with respect to the amended claims have been fully considered but have not been found convincing. Applicant's arguments are addressed below in the context of the reiteration of the rejection of record in Paper No. 23 as applied to the amended and newly added claims.

The amended and newly added claims recite:

- A) nucleotide sequences encoding "percent identity variants" of a B7RP1 polypeptide;
- B) nucleotide sequences "comprising a fragment", and nucleotide sequences encoding a polypeptide "fragment"; and
- C) a nucleotide sequence which "hybridizes under high stringency conditions".

The Guidelines for the Examination of Patent Applications Under the 35 U.S.C. 112, ¶ 1 "Written Description" Requirement make clear that the written description requirement for a claimed genus may be satisfied through sufficient description of a representative number of species by actual reduction to practice, reduction to drawings, or by disclosure of relevant, identifying characteristics, i.e., structure or other physical and or chemical properties, by functional characteristics coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between function and structure, or by a combination of such identifying characteristics, sufficient to show the applicant was in possession of the genus (Federal Register, Vol. 66, No. 4, pages 1099-1111, Friday January 5, 2001, see especially page 1106 3<sup>rd</sup> column).

Regarding the instant claim limitations, the specification does not appear to provide an adequate written description for the following reasons:

A) "Percent Identity Variants":

As previously noted, Applicant has disclosed nucleic acids encoding two human and one mouse B7-RP1 polypeptide, and thus has disclosed only a limited number of nucleic acid "variants". The claims recite a genus of nucleic acids but do not require that the polypeptides encoded by the instant nucleic acids share any testable functional activity, a feature deemed essential to the instant invention. In the absence of a particular testable function and some structural basis for that function that must be maintained by the members of the genus, the claimed invention is not described in such a way as to reasonably convey to one of ordinary skill in the art that the inventor, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the invention. See Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly & Co., 119F3d 1559, 1569, 43 USPQ2d 1398, 1406 (Fed. Cir. 1997).

Art Unit: 1644

Applicant argues in the response filed 5/5/03 that functionality is not essential to the invention and that, even were it essential, the instant claims now recite a function for the encoded polypeptide (i.e., "at least one activity characteristic of B7RP1"). Applicant further argues that a recitation of "70% identity" provides adequate structure to describe the instantly claimed polypeptides.

However, there does not appear to be an adequate written description in the specification as filed as to a *correlation* between the structures encompassed by 70% identity or variants of the recited sequence and any *particular* function. Further, it is noted that the instant claims fail to provide a recitation of a meaningful function which could be correlated to a particular structure because an activity "characteristic of B7RP1" does not provide any particular function with which any aspect to the structure can be correlated.

The Examiner acknowledges that a recitation of a particular function is not required for those nucleic acids comprising a *defined* structure for which a function has been described in the specification. However, when the structure of the nucleic acid in the genus varies in such a way that the aspect of the structure that provided the described function of the encoded polypeptide is no longer necessarily present, then a testable functional activity is essential to an adequate written description of the recited genus.

B) "Fragments":

As previously noted, fragment language that encompasses open (comprising) claim language permits unidentified flanking sequence to be added any subsequence of a particular SEQ ID NO and so does not allow one skilled in the art to visualize or recognize the identity of the subject matter purportedly described. Fragments which comprise unidentified flanking sequence or have variation within their sequence thus do not meet the written description requirement. Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar, 19 USPQ2d 1111, makes clear that "applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of the invention. The invention is, for purposes of the written description inquiry, whatever is now claimed." (id at 1117.) The specification does not "clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed." (id at 1116.).

Applicant argues in the Remarks filed 5/5/03 that it is not necessary that every possible flanking sequence be described, and that "comprising" language in and of itself does not render a claim unpatentable. The Examiner acknowledges both points, but notes that in order to meet the written description requirement there must be a structure conserved that is representative of the genus claimed. For example, comprising language is appropriate with respect to nucleic acids comprising the full length coding sequence or comprising an internal fragment that encodes a fragment of a given polypeptide to which a particular function can be attributed.

However, when the fragment is not a functional fragment then the function of members of the genus of polypeptides comprising that fragment depends upon the flanking sequences and a description of the flanking sequence is required.

In addition, it is noted that the instant claim language is not drawn to true internal fragments of a nucleic acid encoding a B7RP1 polypeptide having a minimal number of amino acid residues as recited (e.g., encoding a fragment of SEQ ID NO:7 comprising at least about 50 amino acid residues"), but instead is drawn to nucleic acid molecules comprising a nucleotide sequence encoding a polypeptides fragment. Thus the instant claims do not require that the flanking sequence be the same as those of the sequences flanking the nucleic acid encoding the fragment of SEQ ID NO:7.

C) "Hybridizes Under High Stringency Conditions":

Applicant has disclosed and reduced to practice three nucleic acids encoding B7-RP1 polypeptides. The genus of nucleic acids which hybridizes to SEQ ID NOS:6, 11 or 16, hybridize to nucleic acids comprising fragments thereof, or hybridize to nucleic acids encoding polypeptides at least about 70% identical is very large and a great deal of variability is encompassed by the instant claims. As noted supra the specification discloses only two human and one mouse nucleic acid. Thus the specification provides at most three members of the instant extensive genus since these nucleic acids would hybridize to their complements.

Applicant argues in the Response filed 5/5/03 that the instant claims now provide both structure and function because the hybridization is over the full length and the encoded polypeptides retain at least one activity characteristic of B7RP1 and concludes that the rejection of record is therefore moot.

However, extensive variation is still permitted even when hybridization occurs over the full length of a sequence under high stringency conditions, particular when the sequence is itself a variant of the referenced nucleic acid. In addition, although some of the subsections of claim 2 now recite that the encoded polypeptide retains at least one activity characteristic of B7RP1, this requirement does not appear in the section reciting the hybridizing nucleic acid and does not appear elsewhere in the claim such that the construction requires that the hybridizing nucleic acid encoded a polypeptide with at least one activity characteristic of B7RP1. It is further noted that an activity "characteristic of B7RP1" (even were it recited with respect to polypeptides encoded by the hybridizing nucleic acids) does not provide any particular function with which any aspect to the structure can be correlated. Finally, it is again noted that the claims do not require that the hybridizing nucleic acids hybridize under any particular set of conditions. Therefore the instant claims do not appear to provide an adequate written description of nucleotide sequences which "hybridize under stringent conditions".

The Examiner for these reasons maintains that the he specification fails to provide an adequate written description of the above noted claim limitations.

Applicant is again directed to the Guidelines for the Examination of Patent Applications Under the 35 U.S.C. 112, ¶ 1 "Written Description" Requirement, Federal Register, Vol. 66, No. 4, pages 1099-1111, Friday January 5, 2001.

The rejections of record are therefore maintained with respect to the amended and newly added claims.

Art Unit: 1644

8. Claims 2-7 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for

nucleic acids "consisting of" or "comprising" SEQ ID NO:6, 11 or 16;  
 nucleic acids encoding polypeptides "consisting of" or "comprising" SEQ ID NO:7, 12 or 17;  
 nucleic acid fragments of SEQ ID NO:6, 11 or 16 in which the claim language clearly limits the fragments to *subsequence* of SEQ ID NO:6, 11 or 16;  
 nucleic acids encoding polypeptides having only limited deviation from a reference sequence (e.g., a nucleic acid encoding a polypeptide 95% identical over the full length of SEQ ID NO:7) AND having a testable function supported in the specification as filed (and priority documents);

does not reasonably provide enablement for

- A) nucleic acids encoding more extensive "percent identity variants";
- B) nucleic "fragments" in any form in which the flanking sequences are undefined; and
- C) a nucleotide sequence which "hybridizes under high stringency conditions"

The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Applicant's arguments, filed 5/5/03, with respect to the amended claims have been fully considered but have not been found convincing. Applicant's arguments are addressed below in the context of the reiteration of the rejection of record in Paper No. 23 as applied to the amended and newly added claims.

The specification discloses that the nucleic acids of SEQ ID NO:11 and SEQ ID NO:16 encode the polypeptides of SEQ ID NO:12 and SEQ ID NO:17, respectively, which are two forms of a human B7-RP1 polypeptide; and that the nucleic acid of SEQ ID NO:6 encode the mouse B7-RP1 polypeptide of SEQ ID NO:7. The specification also discloses in the Examples that B7-RP1 is, along with CRP1, part of a costimulatory receptor-ligand pair.

A) "Encoding Variant Polypeptides":

As previously noted, the state of the art at the time the invention was made recognized that even single amino acid differences can result in drastically altered functions between two proteins. For example, Metzler et al. (Nature Structural Biol. 1997; 4:527-531, of record) showed that any of a variety of single amino acid changes can alter or abolish the ability of the CTLA4 to interact with its ligands CD80 and CD86 (B7-1 and B7-2) (e.g., summarized in Table 2). The variation in function among "B7-like" polypeptides is further emphasized by the teachings of Coyle et al. (Nature Immunol. 2:203-209 2001, of record) who show that the B7-like family members have distinct expression patterns *and distinct functions*, even though they share certain conserved amino acid residues and domain structure (see in particular Figures 2 and 3).

Thus the state of the art recognized that it is unpredictable if any particular functional activity will be shared by two polypeptides having less than 100% identity over the full length of their sequences. Given the extensive variation permitted by the instant claim language drawn to nucleic acids encoding polypeptides which vary in their amino acid sequence, the skilled artisan would not reasonably expect such "variant" polypeptides to have the same function as the instantly recited SEQ ID NOS, particularly when the family of B7-like proteins was known to have variable function.

The specification does not appear to provide sufficient guidance as to which residues should or should not be changed to preserve any particular function. Although the specification does provide working examples of human and mouse B7-RP1 polypeptides, the variation permitted by the instant claim language is extensive.



Art Unit: 1644

Applicant asserts in the Remarks filed 5/5/03 that because the instant claims now require that the polypeptide have at least one activity "characteristic of B7RP1", the skilled artisan would be able to make nucleic acids encoding polypeptides having changes in their amino acid sequence and select for those which maintained at least one activity characteristic of B7RP1.

However, the specification as filed appears to provide sufficient guidance only with respect to two activities of B7RP1: binding to CRP1 and stimulation of T cell proliferation and/or activation (page 42 at lines 1-6). The instant recitation encompasses in its scope any activity that may, by any undefined criteria, be considered to be an "activity characteristic" of B7RP1. The state of the art at the time the invention was made did not recognize what those activities of B7RP1 were. In addition, as set forth supra, the skilled artisan at the time the invention was made recognized that polypeptides belonging to the B7 family of molecules had distinct functions. Thus the skilled artisan recognized that for any new member of the B7 family, it was unpredictable as to what particular activities would be "characteristic" of a given member. Further, it is unclear from the guidance provided in the specification as filed as to what constitutes a "characteristic" activity. Is an activity "characteristic" if other molecules in a family share that activity (e.g., other members of the B7 family stimulate T cells to proliferate)? In view of the limited number of working examples regarding activities of a B7RP1 polypeptide, the limited guidance as to what constitutes a "characteristic" activity, and the scope of activities encompassed; there does not appear to be sufficient guidance provided in the specification as filed with respect to an "activity characteristic of B7RP1".

Applicant also argues that it would not require undue experimentation to make polypeptides having 70% identity to one of the B7RP-1 polypeptides because it was routine practice in the art at the time the invention was made to make modifications in a polypeptide and test it for activity. Applicant equates the experimentation involved to that of making and screening monoclonal antibodies for a particular specificity. However, the instant fact pattern lacks the predictability associated with making and screening monoclonal antibodies. In the absence of guidance as to which amino acid residues provide a particular function, it is unpredictable which, if any, sequences having 70% identity would maintain that function. In the absence of such guidance, the claim is little more than a wish to know the identity of those related sequences which share any function which may be considered an "activity characteristic of B7RP1" and their encoding nucleic acids.

Consequently, the experimentation left to those skilled in the art to determine which "variant" sequences would still encode polypeptides having the same function as the human and mouse B7-RP1 polypeptides disclosed in the specification as filed is unnecessarily, and improperly, extensive and undue.

It is again suggested that Applicant limit the claims to nucleic acids sequences encoding polypeptides having only limited variation (e.g. 95% identity) *over the full length* of the sequence, AND *possessing testable functional activity* supported in the specification and priority documents.

B) "Fragments":

The instant claims also still recite in various forms nucleic acids comprising "fragments" of a certain number of residues or encoding polypeptide fragments. "Comprising" language opens the claim up to the inclusion of additional residues of undisclosed identity and number flanking the recited "fragment". It is again acknowledged that the skilled artisan can make fragments *limited to subsequences* of the individual SEQ ID NOS without undue experimentation. However, before the skilled artisan can make nucleotide sequences with additional flanking sequence, guidance is required with respect to the identity of those flanking sequences.

Art Unit: 1644

Applicant argues in the Remarks filed 5/5/03 that the specification provides guidance as to flanking sequences that may be added to a nucleic acid encoding a fragment of B7RP1, such as the addition of the Fc region of IgG1, and asserts that other nucleic acids encoding fusions of a B7RP1 fragment to other proteins could also be prepared.

The Examiner acknowledges that the specification does provide sufficient guidance with respect to certain fusion proteins. However, guidance with respect to a fusion protein comprising the extracellular domain fragment of B7RP1 and the Fc region of IgG1 is a single example limited to a nucleic acid encoding a particular fragment of B7RP1, the extracellular domain. The scope of the instant claims encompasses *any* fragment and *any* additional sequences. The issue is not the "comprising" language per se, it is the fact that insufficient guidance appears to have been provided with respect to the identity of the parts.

C) "Hybridization":

The fact that two nucleic acid sequences will hybridize under high stringency conditions does not in and of itself require that the two sequences encode proteins which share any functional activity. Thus the same observations apply to the recitation of "hybridizes" as were noted above with respect to "percent identity" language.

Applicant argues in the Response filed 5/5/03 that the instant claims now provide both structure and function because the hybridization is over the full length at high stringency and the encoded polypeptides retain at least one activity characteristic of B7RP1. Applicant concludes that the rejection of record is therefore moot.

However, extensive variation is still permitted even when hybridization occurs over the full length of a sequence under high stringency conditions, particular when the sequence is itself a variant of the referenced nucleic acid. In addition, although some of the subsections of claim 2 now recite that the encoded polypeptide retains at least one activity "characteristic of B7RP1", this requirement does not appear in the section reciting the hybridizing nucleic acid and does not appear elsewhere in the claim such that the construction requires that the hybridizing nucleic acid encoded a polypeptide with at least one activity characteristic of B7RP1. It is further noted that an activity "characteristic of B7RP1" (even were it recited with respect to polypeptides encoded by the hybridizing nucleic acids) does not provide any particular function with which any aspect to the structure can be correlated. Finally, it is again noted that the claims do not require that the hybridizing nucleic acids hybridize under any particular set of conditions.

Therefore the instant hybridization language still does not require *a testable function* and limitations regarding both the hybridization *conditions* and thus does not allow the skilled artisan to make and use the hybridizing nucleic acids commensurate in scope with the instant claims without undue experimentation.

Thus with respect to the above noted claim limitations, each of which encompass considerable breadth and for each of which the specification provides only limited guidance; it would require undue experimentation of the skilled artisan to make and use such polypeptides; thus the experimentation left to those skilled in the art is unnecessarily, and improperly, extensive and undue.

The rejections of record are therefore maintained with respect to the amended and newly added claims.

9. Claims 36 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The following written description rejection is set forth herein. This is a New Matter rejection for the following reasons:

Applicant's amendment asserts that no New Matter has been added and points to the specification at page 23, lines 24-29, page 41 at line 32 to page 42 at line 6 and Figure 12 for support for newly added claim 36 which recites an amino terminus at "about" various residues. Applicant's amendment also points to the specification at page 23, lines 24-29, page 41 at line 32-42, and Figure 12 for support for the newly added claim 37 which recites "a carboxy terminus at about residue 302".

However, the specification does not appear to provide an adequate written description of either an amino terminus at "about" certain residues or for "a carboxy terminus at about residue 302".

Page 23 at lines 24-29 and page 41 at line 32 to page 42 at line 6 appear to be cited to support other aspects of claims 36 and 37. Figure 12 provides a nucleotide and amino acid sequence showing that amino acid 302 is the carboxy terminus and showing that the amino terminus could be at positions 1, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24 or 28. It is noted that original claim 2 also provides support for alternate amino terminal amino acids of these defined positions.

However, there does not appear to be there does not appear to be a description either in Figure 12 or elsewhere in the specification or original claims that the Examiner was able to identify of an amino terminus of SEQ ID NO:17 at "about" residue 1, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24 or 28. The inclusion of the term "about" changes the scope of the claim to encompass amino termini at positions other than those notes supra. Thus there does not appear to be adequate written support for the instant claim language.

Neither does there appear to be a description either in Figure 12 or elsewhere in the specification or original claims that the Examiner was able to identify of variation in the carboxy terminus that could be construed as providing support for "at about residue 302". A single species of carboxy terminus within the scope of "at about residue 302" has been described.

It is acknowledged that there is support for alternate amino termini (as recited in original claim 2), and that if the truncated amino terminus is renumbered as "1" then the polypeptide set forth in Figure 12A could be said to have a carboxy terminus at about residue 302. However, there does not appear to be sufficient support for the instant wording describing an *alternate* carboxy terminus since it is the length of the polypeptide that changes with an amino terminal truncation – not the identity of the residues found at the carboxy terminus.

The instant claims now recite limitations which were not clearly disclosed in the specification and claims as filed, and now change the scope of the instant disclosure as filed. Such limitations recited in the present claims, which did not appear in the specification or original claims, as filed, introduce new concepts and violate the description requirement of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112.

Applicant is required to cancel the New Matter in the response to this Office Action. Alternatively, Applicant is invited to clearly point out the written support for the instant limitations.

***Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103***

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

*(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.*

*(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.*

11. Claims 2-4, 7 and 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Ishikawa et al (DNA Res. June 1998; 5:169-176, of record, see entire document) as evidenced by GenBank Accession No. AB014553 (released 06 Feb 1999, of record).

Applicant's arguments, filed 5/5/03, with respect to the amended claims have been fully considered but have not been found convincing. Applicant's arguments are addressed following a reiteration of the rejection of record in Paper No. 23 as applied to the amended and newly added claims.

Ishikawa et al. teach KIAA0653, and that the sequence information for the cDNA of KIAA0653 is available under accession number AB014553 (see entire document, but especially Table 1, first column). Ishikawa et al. also teach that the protein product of KIAA0653 was produced by in vitro translation (see comments in Section 2.1 on page 169 regarding original screening method); therefore, the cDNA clone KIAA0653 must also have been operably linked to an expression control sequence and placed in a host cell.

Ishikawa et al. teach that the KIAA0653 has homology to CD80, the original member of the B7 family of co-stimulatory proteins (e.g. see Table 2, page 175).

KIAA0653 encompasses the entire nucleotide sequence set forth in SEQ ID NO:11. Thus KIAA0653 is an isolated nucleic acid comprising:

the nucleotide sequence as set forth in SEQ ID NO:11;

the nucleotide sequence encoding a polypeptide as set forth in SEQ ID NO:12 from residues 1-288;

a nucleotide sequence encoding a polypeptide fragment of at least about 25, 50, 75, 100 or greater than 100 amino acid residues of instant SEQ ID NO: 12;

a nucleotide sequence comprising a fragment of at least about 10, 15, 20, 25, 50, 75, 100 or greater than 100 nucleotides of SEQ ID NO:11; and

a nucleotide sequence which hybridizes under high stringency conditions to SEQ ID NO:11.

KIAA0653 also encompasses the nucleic acid sequence as set forth in SEQ ID NO:16 from approximately nucleotide 209 to 1098. Thus KIAA0653 is also a nucleotide sequence encoding a polypeptide fragment of at least about 25, 50, 75, 100 or greater than 100 amino acid residues of instant SEQ ID NO: 17, and a nucleotide sequence comprising a fragment of at least about 10, 15, 20, 25, 50, 75, 100 or greater than 100 nucleotides of SEQ ID NO:16.

Applicant argues in the Remarks filed 5/5/03 that Ishikawa et al. is a non-enabling reference because it does not by itself place the public in possession of the invention without the teachings of the evidentiary reference of GenBank Accession No. AB014553, which is not available as prior art.

Art Unit: 1644

It is acknowledged that in some cases sequence information may be held in a confidential manner by GenBank upon request by the submitter. However, it is noted that the policy of GenBank has been that *if a paper citing the sequence or accession number is published prior to a specified date, the sequence will be released upon publication*. Thus it appears that the disclosure of the GenBank accession number in Ishikawa et al. was sufficient to place the public in possession of the instantly claimed invention because even though the release date of Accession No. AB014553 was after the effective filing date of the instant claims, the policy of GenBank regarding sequence availability after publication permitted a public in possession of the Accession No. taught by Ishikawa et al. to obtain the sequence information.

It is further noted that the Ishikawa et al. indicate in Section 2.2 that the reaction conditions and PCR primers were available upon request (see especially first partial paragraph, page 172). Thus even in the absence of the GenBank accession number, it would appear that Ishikawa et al. provided the necessary information to place the public in possession of a method of making the instantly claimed invention.

Applicant is again reminded that no more of the reference is required than that it sets forth the substance of the invention. The instant limitations, including encoding a polypeptide with at least one activity "characteristic of B7RP1", would be inherent properties of KIAA0653.

The reference teachings thus anticipate the instant claimed invention.

The rejection is therefore maintained as applied to the amended claims.

12. Claims 2, 4, 6 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by GenBank Accession No. R23544 (GI:778432, released 20 April 1995, of record).

Applicant's arguments, filed 5/5/03, with respect to the amended claims have been fully considered but have not been found convincing. Applicant's arguments are addressed following a reiteration of the rejection of record in Paper No. 23 as applied to the amended and newly added claims.

R23544 is an isolated nucleic acid sequence 365 nucleotides in length that is 100% identical to instant SEQ ID NO:11 from nucleotide 407 to 771.

Instant SEQ ID NO:16 comprises instant SEQ ID NO:11; therefore R23544 is also 100% identical to instant SEQ ID NO:16 from approximately nucleotide 606 to 970.

R23544 is also taught to be a cDNA insert of a clone that is propagated in the lab host DH10B, a prokaryotic cell.

R23544 is also:

- a nucleotide sequence encoding a polypeptide fragment of at least about 50, 75, 100 or greater than 100 amino acid residues of instant SEQ ID NO: 12 or instant SEQ ID NO:17;
- a nucleotide sequence comprising a fragment of at least about 75, 100 or greater than 100 nucleotides of SEQ ID NO:11 or SEQ ID NO:16; and
- a nucleotide sequence which hybridizes under stringent conditions to SEQ ID NO:11 or SEQ ID NO:16.

Art Unit: 1644

Applicant argues that GenBank Accession No. R23544 fails to teach each and every element of any subpart of the instant claims as amended. Applicant argues that R23544 does not encode a polypeptide at least 70% identical to the instantly encoded polypeptides. However, it is noted that subpart (e) of claim 2 and claim 34 each encompasses fragments of these encoding sequences, which does encompass R23544.

Applicant also argues that no functional information is provided for R23544, and thus the recitation requiring that various encoded polypeptides have at least one activity "characteristic of B7RP1" is a limitation not anticipated by the R23544. However, the activity the polypeptide encoded by a given nucleic acid is inherent to the sequence. Applicant has provided no evidence that the polypeptide encoded by R23544 would not possess at least one activity characteristic of B7RP1.

Applicant is again reminded that no more of the reference is required than that it sets forth the substance of the invention. The instant limitations would be inherent properties of R23544.

The reference teachings thus anticipate the instant claimed invention and the rejection is maintained as applied to the amended and newly added claims.

13. Claims 2, 4, 6 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by GenBank Accession No. AA510455 (GI:2248309, released 08 July 1997, of record).

Applicant's arguments, filed 5/5/03, with respect to the amended claims have been fully considered but have not been found convincing. Applicant's arguments are addressed following a reiteration of the rejection of record in Paper No. 23 as applied to the amended and newly added claims.

AA510455 is an isolated nucleic acid sequence 440 nucleotides in length that is 99.7% identical to instant SEQ ID NO:6 from nucleotide 1 to 309, and 100% identical to SEQ ID NO:6 from nucleotide 120-309.

AA510455 is also taught to be a cDNA insert of a clone that is propagated in the lab host DH10B, a prokaryotic cell.

AA510455 is also:

- a nucleotide sequence encoding a polypeptide fragment of at least about 50 amino acid residues of instant SEQ ID NO:7;

- a nucleotide sequence comprising a fragment of at least about 75, 100 or greater than 100 nucleotides of SEQ ID NO:6; and

- a nucleotide sequence which hybridizes under stringent conditions to SEQ ID NO:6.

Applicant argues that GenBank Accession No. AA510455 fails to teach each and every element of any subpart of the instant claims as amended. Applicant argues that AA510455 does not encode a polypeptide at least 70% identical to the instantly encoded polypeptides. However, it is noted that subpart (e) of claim 2 and claim 34 each encompasses fragments of these encoding sequences, which does encompass AA510455.

Art Unit: 1644

Applicant also argues that no functional information is provided for AA510455, and thus the recitation requiring that various encoded polypeptides have at least one activity "characteristic of B7RP1" is a limitation not anticipated by the AA510455. However, the activity the polypeptide encoded by a given nucleic acid is inherent to the sequence. Applicant has provided no evidence that the polypeptide encoded by AA510455 would not possess at least one activity characteristic of B7RP1.

Applicant is again reminded that no more of the reference is required than that it sets forth the substance of the invention. The instant limitations would be inherent properties of AA510455.

The reference teachings thus anticipate the instant claimed invention and the rejection is maintained as applied to the amended and newly added claims.

14. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

*(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.*

15. Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishikawa et al (DNA Res. June 1998; 5:169-176, of record, see entire document) as evidenced by GenBank Accession No. AB014553 (released 06 Feb 1999, of record) in view of Linsley et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,580,756, of record).

Applicant's arguments, filed 5/5/03, with respect to the amended claims have been fully considered but have not been found convincing.

Applicant argues that Ishikawa et al. is a non-enabling reference for the reasons set forth supra, and that Linsley et al. do not remedy the deficiencies of Ishikawa et al. Applicant's arguments regarding Ishikawa et al. have not been found convincing for the reasons et forth supra.

The rejection of record is applied to the amended and newly added claims as set forth below.

The claims are drawn to a host cell comprising a B7RP-1 nucleic acid, wherein the host cell is a eukaryotic cell or a prokaryotic cell.

Ishikawa et al. have been discussed supra, and in brief, teach a B7 (CD80)-related polypeptide encoded by KIAA0653.

Art Unit: 1644

Although a host cell was necessarily present in the teachings of Ishikawa et al. since the protein was expressed, Ishikawa et al. do not explicitly teach either a eukaryotic host cell or a prokaryotic host cell comprising KIAA0653.

However, as noted supra, Ishikawa et al. do teach that the ordinary artisan at the time the invention was made was motivated to express the protein so that the protein could be further characterized.

Linsley et al. teach the B7 (CD80) polypeptide and its characterization as a co-stimulatory protein (see entire document, e.g., "Summary of the Invention" at columns 3-4).

Linsley et al. teach that the B7 protein could be expressed in either a prokaryotic or eukaryotic host cells (see columns 7-9 in particular).

The ordinary artisan at the time the invention was made would therefore have found it obvious to express the protein product of KIAA0653 in either a eukaryotic or prokaryotic host cell. The ordinary artisan at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to express the protein product of KIAA0653 using each type of host cell, since each system has its own advantages and disadvantages (e.g., glycosylation patterns, ease of isolation of protein, etc.). Expression of proteins in either eukaryotic or prokaryotic hosts was a matter of common practice at the time the invention was made, such that the ordinary artisan would have had a reasonable expectation that both types of host cells could be used. Therefore, the invention as a whole was prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, as evidenced by the references, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

### ***Double Patenting***

16. Applicant's request to hold in abeyance the previous rejection of claim 2-7 as provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 until such time as allowable subject matter is determined is acknowledged.

### **IDS**

17. Applicant's IDS, filed 2/6/03 (Paper No. 24), is acknowledged.

Applicant's submission of Search Reports on the IDS is acknowledged, however this citation has been crossed out as the Search Report per se is not appropriate for an IDS.



*Conclusion*

18. Claims 35 and 38 appear to be allowable.
19. A claim drawn to an isolated nucleic acid consisting of SEQ ID NO:11 would appear to be free of the prior art.
20. Claims drawn to an isolated nucleic acid consisting of or comprising the nucleotide sequence set forth in SEQ ID NO:6 would appear to be free of the prior art.
21. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).
- A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.
22. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jessica Roark, whose telephone number is (703) 605-1209. The examiner can normally be reached Monday to Friday from 8:00 to 4:30. A message may be left on the examiner's voice mail service. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Chan can be reached at (703) 308-3973. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Technology Center 1600 receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.
- Papers related to this application may be submitted to Technology Center 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Technology Center 1600 via the PTO Fax Center located in Crystal Mall 1. The faxing of papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). The CM1 Fax Center number for after final submissions is 703 872-9307.

Jessica Roark, Ph.D.  
Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 1600  
July 22, 2003

PHILLIP GAMBEL  
PHILLIP GAMBEL, PH.D.  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
TECH CENTER 1600  
7/22/03